

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 1, 2005. Claims 1-26, 35 and 36 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 8, 15, 23-25 and 35 are in independent form. Claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 15-19 and 22-26 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Claims 27-34 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and will not be mentioned further. Claims 35 and 36 have been added to provide Applicant with a more complete scope of protection. The specification has been amended to conform the Summary of the Invention section to the current claim language. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 15, 18 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,838,319 (*Guzak et al.*), or alternatively under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from that patent in view of the cited Windows NT screen shots. Claims 2, 9, 16 and 23-26 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being obvious from *Guzak* in view of U.S. Patent 5,895,474 (*Maarek et al.*), and also as being obvious from *Guzak* in view of the Windows NT screen shots and *Maarek*. Claims 3, 5, 10, 12, 17 and 19 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being obvious from *Guzak* in view of U.S. Patent 6,003,040 (*Mital et al.*), and also as being obvious from *Guzak* in view of the Windows NT screen shots and *Mital*.

In addition, Claims 6, 13 and 20 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being obvious from *Guzak* in view of the cited *Cowart* publication, and as being obvious from *Guzak* in view of the Windows NT screen shots and *Cowart*, and Claims 7, 14 and 21

were rejected under Section 103(a) as being obvious from *Guzak*, and as being obvious from *Guzak* in view of the Windows NY screen shots.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus capable of communicating with a plurality of peripheral devices. The apparatus of Claim 1 comprises a storage device, for storing predetermined objects for the peripheral devices based on directory information. Designation means are provided, for designating a specific object indicating a peripheral device having a predetermined function, and detection means, responsive to a designation by the designation means, detect the designated specific object in the directory information read from the storage device. Also provided are display means, for displaying, in accordance with a tree list, the specific object detected by the detection means, and control means, which, based on the number of steps along a directory path leading from a local object corresponding to one of the peripheral devices locally connected to the information processing apparatus to the specific object corresponding to another specific peripheral device, having the same function but not locally connected to the information processing apparatus, permit the display means to display, in accordance with the tree list, the specific object detected by the detection means.

Among other important features of Claim 1 are the designation means that designate a specific object indicating a peripheral device having a predetermined function, and the point that the peripheral device for the local object and the peripheral device for the specific object designated by the designation means are ones that have the same function.

Thus, one very important advantage of the apparatus of Claim 1 is the searching for a peripheral device that has the same function as the peripheral device designated by the designation means. Support for this feature can be found, at the least, in

the specification at page 15 (element 48 of Fig. 4). When a search button for a printer, for example, is provided and clicked, one or more devices having a printer function corresponding to the button are searched out, and the search result is displayed.

The Examiner's primary reference, *Guzak*, has been adequately discussed previously, and it is not deemed necessary to repeat that discussion. Even if a combination of *Guzak* with Windows NT (assuming *arguendo* that the proposed combination would be a permissible one) would display locally-connected disk devices and network-connected PCs distinguishably from each other, such combination would still not include, and would not in any way suggest, the detection means or the control means, much less the recitation that "the peripheral device for the local object and the peripheral device for the specific object designated by said designation means have the same function", as recited in Claim 1. For at least that reason, Claim 1 is believed to be clearly allowable over *Guzak*, taken alone or in any possible combination (if any) with the cited Windows NT features.

Independent Claim 23 is directed to an information processing apparatus capable of communicating with a plurality of peripheral devices that comprises a storage device, for storing predetermined objects for the peripheral devices based on directory information. There are provided designation means for designating a specific object indicating a peripheral device having a predetermined function, and detection means, responsive to a designation by the designation means, for detecting the specific designated object in the directory information read from the storage device. Claim 23 recites that the peripheral device for the local object and the peripheral device for the specific object designated by the designation means have the same function. Display means are provided, for displaying, in accordance with a tree list, the specific object detected by the detection

means, and control means that, when the detected object is to be displayed on the display means in accordance with a tree list, omit an intermediate directory path to the specific object. Claim 23 also recites that the control means permit the display means, based on the number of steps along a directory path leading from a local object corresponding to one of the peripheral devices locally connected to the information processing apparatus to the specific object corresponding to another specific peripheral device not locally connected to the information processing apparatus, to display, in accordance with the tree list, the specific object detected by the detection means.

Claim 23 is believed to be allowable over the prior art discussed above, for at least the reasons advanced above with regard to Claim 1.

Independent Claim 35 is directed to an information processing apparatus having a search function, comprising a registration means, a display means, a designation means and a search means. The registration means register a peripheral device in correspondence to a predetermined peripheral device folder. The display means display a search designation object for designating a search designation provided in correspondence to the peripheral device folder. The designation means designate the search designation object. The search means search, responsive to a designation by the designation means, for a peripheral device having a function corresponding to the search designation object designated by the designation means, and the display means display a search result obtained by the search means.

Claim 35 is believed to be allowable over *Guzak*, alone or in any possible combination (if any) with the Windows NT screen shots.

Independent Claims 8, 15, 24 and 25 are, respectively, method and computer memory medium claims respectively corresponding to apparatus Claims 1 and 23, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with the latter claims.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Leonard P. Diana", is written over a horizontal line.

Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 503848v1